



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,522	03/31/2004	Richard Warren Hailey	014586-9009-02	6921
1131 7590 02/15/2008 MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP Two Prudential Plaza 180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000 CHICAGO, IL 60601			EXAMINER FABER, DAVID	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/15/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/814,522

Applicant(s)

HAILEY ET AL.

Examiner

David Faber

Art Unit

2178

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David Faber.

(3) Derek Stettner.

(2) Kevin P. Rizzuto.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Poole, Bantz, & Bell.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the Applicant's invention and possible proposed amendments that may overcome the prior art rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

David Faber
Examiner's signature, if required

PTOL-413A (10-07)
Approved for use through 10/31/2007, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/914,522 First Named Applicant: Richard Warren Hailey
Examiner: David Faber Art Unit: _____ Status of Application: pending/Non-Final

Tentative Participants:

(1) Kevin P. Rizzuto (2) Derek Stettner (Reg # 37,945)
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: Jan. 18, 2008 Proposed Time: 10:30 ^{EST} (AM/PM)
(anytime between 10:30 - 2:30)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>claim 1</u>	<u>Pool, Bantz, ?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	<u>Bell</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Dispute proposed amendment to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that
Bell, as well as Pool and Bantz, fail to disclose "automatically dynamically
choosing one of the matching components."

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Kevin P. Rizzuto
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

59,229
Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Group Art Unit 2178

In re

Patent Application of

Richard Warren Hailey et al.

Serial No. 10/814,522

Confirmation No. 5921

Filed: March 31, 2004

Examiner: David Faber

"DOCUMENT CREATION SYSTEM AND
METHOD USING KNOWLEDGE BASE,
PRECEDENCE, AND INTEGRATED RULES"

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This communication is in response to the non-final Office action dated December 11, 2007, for Serial No. 10/814,522, and is filed within the three-month shortened statutory period set for response to the Office action. In the event Applicant has overlooked the need to request an extension of time, please consider this a request for the same. Charge or credit Deposit Account No. 13-1180 with any shortage or overpayment of the fees associated with this communication. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter and consider the following amendments and remarks made herein. Please amend the application as set forth below.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of the claims, which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Drawings begin on page 4 of this paper.

U.S. Application No. 0/814,522

Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

Remarks begin on page 5 of this paper.

U.S. Application No. 0/814,522
Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

Amendments to the Claims

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims

1. (Currently Amended) A document generation system comprising:

an assembly facility configured to apply precedence and rules to document content and configured to be coupled to an origination platform;

wherein precedence involves identifying two or more matching document components and automatically dynamically choosing one of the matching components;

a knowledge base stored in computer memory and configured to be coupled to the assembly facility and to store content in a hierarchy; and

a content management system configured to be coupled to the knowledge base and to support authoring of document content and rules.
2. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the assembly facility is configured to validate data received from the origination platform.
3. (Previously Presented) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the assembly facility is configured to receive transaction information from the origination platform.
4. (Canceled)
5. (Canceled)
6. (Currently Amended) A document generation system as claimed in claim 3 ~~claim 5~~, wherein the assembly facility is configured to generate a resolved, markup language file.
7. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 6, wherein the resolved, markup language file is an XML file to which a style sheet may be applied to generate a file in an output format.
8. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the assembly facility is configured to operate with an interface to receive information from the origination platform.

U.S. Application No. 0/814,522

Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

9. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 8, wherein the interface is an application programming interface.
10. (Previously Presented) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the knowledge base is configured to be loaded by a press process.
11. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the knowledge base includes a plurality of stored procedures.
12. (Previously Presented) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the knowledge base is configured to be loaded by a press process and includes a plurality of stored procedures.
13. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the knowledge base includes a plurality of object stores.
14. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 13, wherein each object store corresponds to an architecture specified by a schema or a document type definition.
15. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 13, wherein the knowledge base includes a rules object store and a content object store.
16. (Previously Presented) A document generation system as claimed in claim 13, wherein each object store is configured to be able to contain a link to an object.
17. (Previously Presented) A document generation system as claimed in claim 16, wherein each object store is configured to be able to contain a link to an object selected from the group consisting of an external object, a binary object, and a character object.
18. (Original) A document generation system as claimed in claim 17, wherein each binary and character object is composed of XML text fragments.
19. - 45. (Canceled)

U.S. Application No. 0/814,522

Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached Replacement Drawing Sheet containing Fig. 22 replaces the previously-filed drawing sheet containing Fig. 22 of this Application. An annotated Drawing Sheet containing a marked-up version of the amended Fig. 22 is also attached.

U.S. Application No. 10/814,522

Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

Remarks

This Response is filed in reply to the Office action dated December 11, 2007. By this Response, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 6. No new matter was added by this Amendment. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein are respectfully requested.

I. Objections to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to due to informalities identified by the Examiner. Applicant has amended the identified informalities and corrected drawings sheets have been provided with this Amendment.

II. Claim Objections

Claim 6 was objected to because it depended from cancelled Claim 5. Claim 6 has been amended to correct this informality. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to Claim 6.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

A. Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 13-18

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 13-18 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,006,242 issued to Poole et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Poole") in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0163809 issued to Bantz et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Bantz"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,168,035 issued to Bell et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Bell"). As discussed below in more detail, Poole, Bantz, and Bell taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest applying precedence to matching document components as claimed.

As the Examiner admitted, "Poole et al and Bantz et al fail to specifically disclose wherein precedence involves identifying two or more matching document components and dynamically choosing one of the matching components." December 11, 2007, Office action, p.5. Poole discloses resolving entity references by selecting the first matching identifier encountered in a catalog, thus it does not disclose applying precedence. Furthermore, Bantz does not cure the deficiencies of Poole with respect to applying precedence. Bantz discloses "a method, computer program product, and data processing system for providing automatic, mass-customized

U.S. Application No. 10/814,522

Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

preparation of disk images" (abstract). Bantz makes no mention whatsoever of applying precedence to document content.

The Examiner relies on Bell to teach wherein "precedence involves identifying two or more matching document components and dynamically choosing one of the matching components" as recited in Claim 1. However, Claim 1 has been amended to require that "precedence involves...automatically dynamically choosing one of the matching components." As noted in Applicant's specification, a user, for instance, will select an object based on its name, and "what is provided is the precedence version of the given object that is deepest in the precedence hierarchy, but not deeper than the position of the document being edited." Specification, ¶ 69. The user does not sift through the hierarchy to select document components; precedence is applied to override objects of low precedence with objects of higher precedence automatically, for instance, by an XML processor. Specification, ¶ 66.

In contrast, Bell discloses a user-friendly application that allows a form designer to create electronic forms by selecting document components from a list of suggestions. Col. 1, lines 7-12. In particular, the application displays hierarchical data to a form designer. Col. 3, lines 3-27. The designer selects particular hierarchical data, and the application displays one or more suggested document components. Id. Each component illustrates a suggested format for the selected data. Id. The designer selects one of the components, and the application formats the hierarchical data based on the selected component and places the formatted data in an electronic form. Id.

The Bell patent only discloses selecting document components based on user input and does not teach or suggest "automatically dynamically choosing one of the matching components." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Bell does not disclose applying precedence to document components as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Poole, Bantz, and Bell, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "an assembly facility configured to apply precedence and rules to document content by selecting document content and configured to be coupled to an origination platform...wherein precedence involves identifying two or more matching document components and automatically dynamically choosing one of the matching components," as recited in Claim 1.

U.S. Application No. 0/814,522

Response to Non-Final Office Action dated Dec. 11, 2007

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set out above, independent Claim 1 is allowable and dependent Claims 2, 3, and 6-18, which depend from independent Claim 1, are also allowable.

B. Claims 10-12

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poole, in view of Bantz and Bell, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,630,127 issued to Moore et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Moore"). Claims 10-12 depend from independent Claim 1 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant also requests that the Examiner telephone the attorneys of record in the event a telephone discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Derek C. Stettner
Reg. No. 37,945

File No. 014586-9009-02
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560